

**REMARKS**

Applicants affirm the election to proceed with claims 1-5 and 10-20 [Group I, Species B].

Claims 1 - 5 and 10 - 20 have been rejected under §§ 102 and 103. These claims have been cancelled.

Submitted herewith are new claims which Applicants believe define patentable subject matter.

**§ 102 Rejection**

Claims 1 - 5, 10 - 14, and 19 have been rejected under § 102 based on Adams (U.S. 6,932,883). These claims have been cancelled.

The new claims presented here correspond roughly to certain of the now cancelled claims as follows:

New Claim	Old Claim
24	1
27	2
28	3
29	4
30	10
31	11
32	12
33	13
34	14
35	15
36	16
37	17
38	18
39	19
42	20

New independent claim 24 and new dependent claim 41 (depending from new independent claim 39) recite these limitations that:

- a. the heating apparatus including a control system, a plurality of spaced-apart heating elements, and a plurality of heat sensors, the plurality of heat sensors spaced-apart and movable adjacent the at least one layer

- of screening material, the heating elements spaced-apart on the heating apparatus, the plurality of heat sensors in communication with the control system
- b. sensing with the plurality of heat sensors temperatures of different portions of the at least one layer of screening material during heating thereof
  - c. controlling the plurality of spaced-apart heating elements with a control system in response to temperatures sensed by the plurality of heat sensors to control heat applied to the different portions of the at least one layer of screening material during heating thereof

Claims 27 - 38, by dependency from new claim 24, recite these same limitations.

Adams has no teaching or suggestion of limitations a., b., and c. above.

None of the cited references has any teaching or suggestion of these limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims discussed above are not anticipated by Adams and that these claims define subject matter patentable with respect to Adams.

#### § 102 Rejection

Claims 1 - 3, 5, 10 - 14, and 19 have been rejected under § 102 based on Winkler et al (U.S. 2002/0000399). These claims have been cancelled.

Applicants repeat here the limitations a., b., and c. as listed above and the discussion of these limitations.

Winkler et al has no teaching or suggestion of limitations a., b., and c. listed above.

Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims discussed above are not anticipated by Winkler et al and that these claims define subject matter patentable with respect to Winkler et al

### § 103 Rejections

All the claims 1 - 5 and 10 - 20 have been rejected under § 103 based on various references. These claims have been cancelled.

Each new claim presented here, [other than new claim 39 and new claims 42 and 43 which depend from new claim 39] includes the limitations a., b., and c. listed and discussed above. No reference cited in the § 103 rejections teaches or suggests what is claimed in these limitations.

Claim 39 corresponds to now-canceled original claim 19; but includes (as do new dependent claims 41 - 43) further limitations regarding the cooling apparatus, including

- the first cooling apparatus including a base and a top platen movable with respect to the base, the first screen assembly emplaceable on the base, the first cooling apparatus having supply apparatus for supplying cooling fluid to the base and to the top platen for cooling the first screen assembly
- emplacing the first screen assembly on the base
- moving the top platen down onto the first screen assembly
- supplying cooling fluid to the base and to the top platen with the supply apparatus to cool the first screen assembly

Neither the Umezawa et al reference (U.S. 6,398,899) nor the Beck reference (U.S. 3,514,834) teaches or suggests a cooling apparatus as now claimed in new Claim 39 or the use of such a cooling apparatus to cool a screen assembly for use in a vibratory separator. Claim 43 in reciting cooling to 88°F in about 2 to 4 minutes recites subject matter neither taught nor suggested by either Umezawa or Beck - two references which have nothing to do with screen assemblies for vibratory separators.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims discussed here define nonobvious, patentable subject matter.

### Double Patenting

Claims 1 - 5, 10 - 14 and 19 - 20 have been rejected for double patenting, based on various references.

These claims have been canceled.

Applicants repeat here the comments above regarding the new claims submitted here, the cited references, and particularly the Umezawa and Beck references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims submitted here claim subject matter not obvious with respect to the references cited in the double patenting rejection (in any possible combination).

### Conclusion

Applicants appreciate the careful and detailed Office Action. This is intended to be a complete Response to the Office Action. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Guy McClung  
Reg. No. 29,008

Date: 27 OCT 05

PMB 347  
16690 Champion Forest Drive  
Spring, TX. 77379--7023

Phone: 281 893 5244

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with sufficient postage as first class U.S. mail with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non Fee Amendments; Commissioner for Patents; P.O. Box 1450; Alexandria VA 22313-1450, on

Date: 27 OCT 05

Guy McClung, Reg. No. 29,008

### CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the original of this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to phone number 571 273 8300, Mail Stop, Commissioner for Patents; P.O. Box 1450; Alexandria VA 22313-1450 on 27 OCT 05

Date: 27 OCT 05

Guy McClung, Reg. No. 29,008